

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 18 2006

Appl. No. 10/695,681  
Amdt. dated September 18, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of June 22, 2006

#### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have received the Office Action dated June 22, 2006, in which the Examiner: 1) rejected claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph; 2) rejected claims 1, 3-6, 9-14, 16-23 and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O. R. Zaine et al., "Discovering Web Access Patterns and Trends by Applying OLAP and Data Mining Technology on Web Logs," Proc, Advances in Digital Libraries, Santa Barbara, April 1998 (hereinafter "Zaine"); in view of Ziauddin (U.S. Pat. No. 6,493,708, hereinafter "Ziauddin"); and 3) objected to claims 2, 7, 8, 15 and 19 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but otherwise allowable. With this Response, Applicants amend claims 1, 2, 7, 11, 18, and 25 and cancel claims 14, 15, and 19.

Applicants do not understand the reason for the § 112, fourth paragraph, rejection of claim 24. Claim 24 depends from claim 18 and clearly provides limitations not found in claim 18. Applicants, however, have corrected a possible antecedent basis issue with regard to the claim 24 phrase "generating a high diagonal cube" (claim 18 already requires the generation of a high diagonal cube). The Examiner may have intended to reject claim 24 under § 112, second paragraph. At any rate, claim 24 complies with § 112, paragraphs 2 and 4.

The Examiner concluded that the subject matter of claim 2 is patentable. Claim 1 has been amended to include some, but not all, of the subject matter of claim 2. Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to require "generating a second summary cube at a second level of abstraction based on the first summary cube, wherein the second summary cube has at least one parent dimension for each dimension of the first summary cube." Applicants do find this limitation in the art of record, and believe the Examiner would agree as well. Applicants contend that the other limitation of claim 2 ("wherein the second summary cube is generated by limiting the dimensions of the first summary cube to a range of values above a predetermined value") is not needed for patentability and has been left in claim 2 and not incorporated into claim 1. Thus, claim 1 and its dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

**Appl. No. 10/695,681**  
**Amdt. dated September 18, 2006**  
**Reply to Office Action of June 22, 2006**


With one exception, independent claim 11 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 15, which the Examiner found to be patentable. The one exception is that the verbiage of claim 15 "where a feature is represented by a dimension" is not needed for patentable and thus has not been included in claim 11. Thus, claim 11 and its dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

Similar amendments have been made to claims 18 and 25 to incorporate much of the subject matter that the Examiner concluded was patentable. Thus, claims 18 and 25 and their dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Jonathan M. Harris  
PTO Reg. No. 44,144  
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.  
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)  
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
Legal Dept., M/S 35  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

180485.01/2182.17701

Page 10 of 10

HP PDNO 10005119-2